

REMARKS

The Office Action has been carefully considered. It is respectfully submitted that the issues raised are traversed, being hereinafter addressed with reference to the relevant headings appearing in the Detailed Action section of the Office Action.

The Applicant has updated Page 1 of the specification with a corrected paragraph pertaining to cross references to related applications. The Applicant submits that these amendments introduce no new matter.

The Applicant has amended claims. The Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to the claim set are fully supported by the originally filed specification.

The Applicant also encloses herewith an Information Disclosure Statement listing cited documents relating to this application.

Claim Objections

In paragraph 1, the Examiner has objected that the wording of claim 1 is awkward. Claim 1 has now been amended to specify "slots in a lower chip restraining layer. We respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

Double Patenting

In paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1 to 20 on the grounds of a nonstatutory type double patenting rejection. In view of this, we are filing herewith a terminal disclaimer to overcome the double patenting objection.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

At page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1 to 8, 10, 13 and 14 as being anticipated by Boyd et al (US Patent No. 6,322,206).

Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter from claim 15. Claim 15 has subsequently been cancelled. The Examiner has indicated on page 6 of the Office Action that the subject matter of claim 15 is allowable.

Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

At page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 9 and 11 as being unpatentable over Boyd et al (US Patent No. 6,322,206) in view of Miura et al (US Patent No. 4,555,717). Furthermore, the Examiner has rejected claim 12 as being unpatentable over Boyd et al (US Patent No. 6,322,206) in view of Waller (US Patent No. US 6,250,738).

As claim 1 has been amended to include allowable subject matter from claim 15, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 and 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance of all the claims presently under examination.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762